



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,905	12/14/2001	Michael Von der Geest	D4701-00198	9583

8933 7590 01/06/2009
DUANE MORRIS LLP - Philadelphia
IP DEPARTMENT
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196

EXAMINER

GEBREMICHAEL, BRUK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3715

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/016,905	Applicant(s) VON DER GEEST ET AL.	
	Examiner BRUK A. GEBREMICHAEL	Art Unit 3715	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-15, 17-22, 24-29, 31-40, 42-52 and 70-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-15, 17-22, 24-29, 31-40, 42-52 and 70-75 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

9999999DETAILED ACTION

1. The following office action is a **Final Office Action** in response to communications received on 10/15/2008. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, 36, 70 and 75 have been amended. Claims 9, 11, 16, 23, 30, 41 and 53-69 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-8, 10, 12-15, 17-22, 24-29, 31-40, 42-52 and 70-75 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- Claims 1-8, 10, 12-15, 17-22, 24, 36-40, 42-47, 70-72 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulton 5,566,291 in view of Sander 2001/0031451.

Regarding claims 1 and 36, Boulton discloses the following claimed limitations, a method of assisting in development of an environment, comprising the steps of receiving with a computer processor unit evaluation data for said environment received from at least one individual participating in said environment (col.3, lines 63-67), said evaluation data relating to a climate of said environment and representing impressions of said individual regarding what it feels like to participate in said environment (see col.4, lines 5-9 and col.8, lines 30-36), providing model data to an individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment, said model data representing one or more dimensions of said climate (col.4, lines 9-11 and col.10, lines 35-51), each

Art Unit: 3715

dimension corresponding to a factor that has a correlation with achievement in said environment by individuals participating in said environment, said model data developed at least in part from said evaluation data (col.9, lines 36-44), each of said one or more dimensions being associated with at least one characteristic of said individual responsible for said environment, receiving with a computer processor unit a selection of at least one of said one or more dimensions of said climate environment received from said individual responsible for said environment (col.27, lines 50-54 and col.28, lines 60-65).

Boulton further implicitly teaches, at least one characteristic known to effect a respective dimension of the climate (col.5, lines 51-63 and col.11, lines 7-14).

Boulton does not explicitly disclose, providing the individual responsible for said environment an action plan for improving at least one characteristic associated with said selected dimension.

However, Sander teaches, providing the individual responsible for said environment an action plan for improving at least one characteristic associated with said selected dimension (Para.0164 and Para.0169).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the invention of Boulton in view of Sander by including an Action Plan in order to suggest to the user the work needed to be performed so that the user would know the steps required to successfully accomplish the given task.

Boulton in view of Sander teaches the claimed limitations as discussed above.

Boulton further discloses,

Regarding claims 2 and 37, the step of receiving evaluation data for said environment from said individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment, said evaluation data representing an impression of said individual regarding said environment (col.11, lines 11-18 and lines 45-55),

Regarding claims 3 and 38, said environment is a classroom teaching environment, said at least one individual participating in said environment includes a first plurality of students, and said individual responsible for said environment is a classroom teacher (col.2, lines 8-16 and col.11, lines 7-18),

Regarding claims 4 and 18, the step of receiving from said classroom teacher a designation of said first plurality of students participating in said classroom teaching environment, said first plurality of students being designated to provide said evaluation data (col.19, lines 1-6 and col.27, lines 50-62),

Regarding claims 8, 15 and 22, receiving from a second plurality of students/employees reevaluation data for said selected classroom teaching/school environment, said reevaluation data representing impressions of said second plurality of students/employees regarding said classroom teaching/school environment at a time after said evaluation data is received from said first plurality of students/employees; and providing second model data to said classroom/head teacher, said second model data representing said one or more dimensions of said climate of said classroom teaching/school environment, said second model data developed at least in part from

Art Unit: 3715

said reevaluation data, each of said one or more dimensions being associated with at least one characteristic of said classroom teacher, said at least one characteristic known to effect a respective dimension (col.19, lines 13-22 and col.33, lines 59-64).

Regarding claims 10 and 24, Boulton in view of Sander teaches the claimed limitations as discussed above.

Boulton in view of sander does not explicitly teach, the second plurality of students/employees includes one or more students/employees from said first plurality of students/employees.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention was made to recognize the fact that Boulton's system in view of sander's is capable of performing the same for any group of people, and also since the system has the capability of filtering by groups, it would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to realize the fact that viewing feedback trends over time using the same group of people helps to reduce the variance of the results that is not correlated to the teacher's performance.

Boulton in view of Sander teaches the claimed limitations as discussed above. Boulton further discloses,

Regarding claims 12 and 42, a plurality of classroom teachers provide evaluation data for a plurality of classroom environments (col.27, lines 50-62), the method further comprising the step of receiving from said plurality of classroom teachers priority data for each of said one or more dimensions, said priority data identifying a respective

Art Unit: 3715

priority level for each of said one or more dimensions (col.17, lines 48-57 and col.28, lines 50-57),

Regarding claims 17 and 45, the environment is a school environment, said at least one individual participating in said environment includes a first plurality of employees within said school environment, and said individual responsible for said environment is a teacher (col.2, lines 8-16 and col.11, lines 7-18).

Boulton in view of Sander does not explicitly disclose, the one individual participating in the environment includes a first plurality of employees within the school environment and the individual responsible for the environment is a head teacher.

Official Action is taken that relationship between school employees and head teacher is a specific type of employee/administrator relationship and it is old and well known in the art at the time of this invention was made for school employees to give feedback to administrators. As already suggested by Boulton, administrators in all types of environments find feedback to be a valuable instrument for improving overall performance (see col.11, lines 20-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention was made to have employees provide feedback to administrators in order to help the administrators improve the school environment based on the collected feedback.

Regarding claims 5-7, 13-14, 19-21, 39-40, 43-44, 46-47 and 75, Boulton in view of Sander teaches the claimed limitations as discussed above with regard to claims 1-3, and 36-38.

Art Unit: 3715

Boulton in view of Sander does not explicitly teach, the evaluation data received from students/employees/teachers identify a current perception of the current state of the environment/classroom and an ideal state of the environment/classroom, the model data identifies differences between the perceptions and ideals of students, teachers, and the community/individuals responsible for the environment, individuals participating in the environment, and the community, and model data is presented graphically.

As already indicated in the previous office action, Official Notice was taken in the Office Action dated 04/20/2007 which stated "both the concept and advantages of identifying both a current perception and ideal states are well known and expected in the art. Many assessments require input of both perceived and ideal states and use the gap between the two in order to develop plans that address areas with the largest gaps. Furthermore, it is well known to compare the views of teachers, students, and the community and to present data graphically." Since the applicant failed to traverse the official notice in the response filed 10/19/2007, the official noticed facts taken in the rejection dated 04/20/2007 are now considered admitted prior art. See MPEP § 2144.03(C) and also the *response to argument* (2) section below, for further detail.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include ideal states in the evaluation data in order to generate action plans suitable for achieving the personal goals of an individual or improving public perception of an individual.

Regarding claims 70-72, Boulton in view of sander teaches the claimed limitations as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 2.

Art Unit: 3715

Boulton further discloses, receiving evaluation data for said environment from said individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment, said evaluation data representing an impression of said individual regarding said environment, the model data are developed at least in part from said evaluation data received from said individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment (col.11, lines 11-18 and lines 45-55).

- Claims 25-29, 31-35, 48-52, 73 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boulton 5,566,291 in view of Sander 2001/0031451 and further in view of Morrel-Samuels 5,743,742 .

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-35, 48-52, 73 and 74, Boulton in view of Sander teaches the claimed limitations as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 17, 45 and 71.

Boulton in view of Sander does not positively teach, environmental aspect assessed by employees/individuals participating in the environment is the leadership of a head teacher/individual responsible for the environment.

However, Morrel-Samuels teaches, environmental aspect assessed by employees/individuals participating in the environment is the leadership of a head teacher/individual responsible for the environment (assessment includes several leadership styles *col.1, lines 59-67 and col.2, lines 1-4* and characteristics associated with leadership styles *FIG 1B*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the invention of Boulton in view of Sander and

Art Unit: 3715

further in view of Morrel-Samuels by incorporating leadership assessment in order to help the administrators identify their strengths and weaknesses as leaders so that the administrators would improve their skills.

Response to Arguments.

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that,

(1) Claim 1 has been amended to better focus the claim with respect to the disclosed concepts of "environment," "climate," "dimensions," "characteristics" and "action plan" discussed above.

Consistent with foregoing description, amended claim 1 emphasizes that the received evaluation data relates to a climate of the environment and represents impressions of the individual participating in the environment regarding what it feels like to participate in the environment.

Claim 1 also recites the step providing model data to an individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment, the model data representing one or more dimensions of said "climate." This step has been amended to further clarify that "each dimension correspond[s] to a factor that has a correlation with achievement in said environment by individuals participating in said environment." . . .

. . . The Examiner points to the reviewer interface of FIGS. 16-19 as corresponding to the model data providing step discussed above. It is submitted that FIGS. 16-19 do not display model data as discussed above. The interface shown in FIG. 16 has an area identified under the headers "location," "context" and "time" that

Art Unit: 3715

allows the user to filter the feedback data that will be shown. The filtered data is then categorized into attribute categories assigned to the feedback data, as shown in window 224, as follows: "situation" 228, which includes segments like user questions, suggestions, etc.; "response group" 232, which includes segments like "higher priority," "waiting for response," etc.; and "sharing" 230, which includes segments showing with whom the feedback data can be shared. (See Col. 29, Lines 29-47). None of these categories or segments (nor their underlying data (e.g., user questions, etc.)) within the categories is "model data" as claimed that represent "dimensions of a climate" where the dimension is understood to have a correlation with achievement in the environment by individuals participating in said environment. Further, these categories are not dimensions where each dimension is associated with a characteristic of the individual responsible for the environment and known to effect the dimension.

(2) Claim 1 also recites the step of "receiving with a computer processor unit a selection of at least one of said one or more dimensions of said climate received from said individual responsible for said environment." As discussed above, Boulton's system does not appreciate or deal in anyway with "dimensions" of a climate. It follows, that Boulton's system does not receive from an individual responsible for an environment a selection of a dimension as claimed. It must be emphasized that a dimension as claimed is a "dimensions of a climate" where that dimension has a correlation with achievement in the environment by individuals participating in said environment and where each dimension is associated with a characteristic of an individual participating in the environment that is known to effect the dimension. Allowing a user to simply filter

Art Unit: 3715

feedback data according to certain attributes cannot be considered selection of a "dimension" as discussed above and as claimed. . .

. . . Turning to Sander et al., the "action plan" of Sander provided to the user is determined by whether the user is classified as a "Beginner," a "Theorist," a "Thinker," etc. See FIG. 7, 11. The Action Plan is general in nature, e.g., "take all educational modules to change categories," and not directed in any way to improvement of a particular dimension of a climate or to a particular characteristic of a person responsible for an environment that would effect a selected dimension.

- In response to argument (1), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. It appears that the Applicant's argument is based on a specific figure cited in the previous office action. It should be clear that whenever the examiner cites a given figure (or column number) of the prior art regarding the teaching of a claimed limitation, the Applicant is required to consider not only that particular figure but, the entire disclosure of the prior art since the claimed limitation is taught in various parts of the reference. For instance, claim 1 recites, *"receiving with a computer processor unit evaluation data for said environment received from at least one individual participating in said environment, said evaluation data relating to a climate of said environment and representing impressions of said individual regarding what it feels like to participate in said environment"*. This claimed feature is clearly taught or suggested by Boulton's reference.

For example the line, "A **feedback interface** of the present invention quickly and easily **collects feedback** from a user. A feedback viewing interface of the present invention receives feedback data from **one or more users** and presents the feedback

Art Unit: 3715

data to a reviewer according to specific preferences of the reviewer.” (see col.3, lines 63-67), clearly teaches or suggests the above recited limitation, “*receiving with a computer processor unit evaluation data for said environment received from at least one individual participating in said environment*”. In this teaching, the “feedback interface” is clearly the *computer processor unit* in the above claim. Similarly, the “feedback from the user” is the *evaluation data* received from the individual, as recited in the above claim. Therefore, Boulton’s reference clearly teaches or suggests the above claimed limitation. This same claimed feature is further taught in various parts of the disclosure of the prior art. For instance, the line, “In the described embodiment, the **feedback interface** is provided within a larger **computer environment** 48. One computer environment described herein is a **learning environment**, which can include such organizational systems as a computer educational system implemented on several networked computers and used to teach course material to students.” (col.8, lines 30-36), also teaches or suggests the above claimed limitation as indicated above.

Further, regarding the recited claimed limitation, “*said evaluation data relating to a climate of said environment and representing impressions of said individual regarding what it feels like to participate in said environment*”, Boulton’s reference teaches this limitation as described below. For example the line, “A preferred method and apparatus of the present invention acquires user **feedback** from **a user** relating to the **user's experiences** in a **specified context** or **location**. The **feedback** includes a portrayal of **a user comment** about the **user's experiences** at the **user's context** or **location**, and a reviewer who is interested in user feedback will typically evaluate the feedback.”

Art Unit: 3715

clearly teaches or suggests the above claimed limitation. In this teaching, the “feedback from a user relating to the user’s experiences in a specified context or location” is the *evaluation data relating to a climate of the environment*, as recited in the above claim; and the “**user comment** about the user’s experience” is clearly the *impressions of the individual regarding what it feels like to participate in the environment*, as recited in the above claim.

Therefore, the examiner concludes that the prior art teaches or suggests Applicant’s currently claimed invention as discussed above (Note that same analysis is used for each claimed limitations).

The Applicant also indicated in the argument that “the classroom “climate” describes what it feels like to be a student in a particular teacher’s class at a particular time. It encompasses **factors** that **influence students’ motivation** to learn and perform to the best of their ability. These **factors** can be strongly **influenced by the teacher.**” (Page 20, lines 23-26 of Applicant’s argument), however, there appears to be no specific or distinct factors claimed in the currently presented claims.

In response to argument (2), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Even though the applicant assumed that Boulton’s system does not appreciate or deal in any way with “dimensions” of a climate, it is very apparent from the teaching of Boulton’s reference that this feature is suggested. For instance, claim 1 recites, “*providing model data to an individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment, said model data representing one or more dimensions of said climate, each dimension*

corresponding to a factor that has a correlation with achievement in said environment by individuals participating in said environment”.

Thus, the line “A **reviewer** receives the **feedback information** at his or her own computer system preferably through a network system connecting the computers in the entire system. Such a network system can be implemented, for example, using a network interface card 29 connected to a computer system 10 as shown in FIG. 1. . . . The viewing interface 46 receives those feedback items from storage block 44 which fall into **preferred categories** and **criteria** of the reviewer. The viewing interface then sorts and displays the feedback data into the **specific categories, patterns, and modes** which the reviewer has specified to be displayed on his or her display screen.” (Boulton, col.10, lines 35-51), clearly teaches or suggests the claimed limitation “*providing model data to an individual that is responsible at least in part for said environment, said model data representing one or more dimensions of said climate*”. In this teaching, the “reviewer” is clearly *the individual that is responsible at least in part for the environment*. Similarly, the specified categories and criteria are the one or more dimensions of the climate. Note that claimed limitations are given broadest interpretation without importing narrow interpretation from the specification.

In the same way, the line “By using feedback interface 42, a **user** can quickly and easily **enter feedback** about a **specific topic** without taking a lot of extra time to do so. Thereafter, a user can just as easily resume the learning process (“flow”) or other activity in the computer environment after inputting the feedback. The **user** is thus encouraged to **enter more feedback**, and **more constructive feedback**, to **help** the

Art Unit: 3715

reviewers or providers on the other end of the system **to improve the learning subject** or the provided product, process, or service.” (Boulton col.9, lines 36-44), teaches or suggests the claimed limitation “*each dimension corresponding to a factor that has a correlation with achievement in said environment by individuals participating in said environment*”. In this teaching, the “user” is the *individual participating in the environment*. The state of helping the reviewers **to improve the learning subject** based on the user’s feedback (e.g. about a specific topic) is clearly, one dimension corresponding to a factor associated with achievement in the given environment. For example, the reviewers adjust or modify the presentation of a given topic based on the feedback information received from the user (i.e. student), so that the user would be successful in his education.

Therefore, here also, the examiner concludes that Applicant’s current claimed invention has already been taught or suggested by the prior art as discussed above.

With regard to Sander’s reference, the Applicant has indicated that the teaching of the reference regarding the “action plan” is general in nature. However, whether the teaching of the reference is general or not, as long as it suggests Applicant’s claimed limitation, it qualifies as a prior art. For instance, claim 1 recites, “*providing said individual responsible for said environment an action plan for improving at least one characteristic associated with said selected dimension*”. This claimed limitation is taught or suggested by Sander’s reference. For example the line, “First, a company **administrator** (or a training service provider) determines which **reference measures** are relevant to the organization and which will determine **successful completion of**

Art Unit: 3715

the training. Each reference measure **comprises characteristics** which can be measured -- see FIG. 2.” (Para.0164) clearly teaches or suggests the “action plan” recited in the above claim. In this teaching, the “company administrator” is the *individual responsible for the environment*. Of course, the action plan is also shown in FIG 2. The characteristics of the reference measures (action plan) represent the *characteristic associated with the selected dimension*, recited in the above claim. According to Sander’s teaching, the Action Plan is also presented to the user to suggest what to do next (Para.0169).

Therefore, here also the examiner concludes that Applicant’s claimed invention has already been taught or suggested by the prior art.

Further, regarding Applicant’s argument concerning the Official Notice, as it has clearly been established in the MPEP § 2144.03(c), in order to traverse the Official Notice, the Applicant is required to specifically point out why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. However, the Applicant has failed to traverse the Official Notice, and therefore it is considered as admitted prior art.

According to MPEP § 2144.03(c), if Applicant Challenges a Factual Assertion as Not Properly Officially Noticed or Not Properly Based Upon Common Knowledge, the Examiner Must Support the Finding With Adequate Evidence.

To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner’s action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR

Art Unit: 3715

1.111(b). See also *Chevenard*, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 (“[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention.”). . .

. . . If applicant does not traverse the examiner’s assertion of official notice or applicant’s traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner’s assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate (MPEP § 2144.03(c)).

Conclusion

Applicant’s amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this final office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filled within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3715

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruk A. Gebremichael whose telephone number is (571)270-3079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday (7:30AM-5:00PM) ALT. Friday OFF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THAI XUAN can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bruk A Gebremichael/
Examiner, Art Unit 3715

/Cameron Saadat/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3715